

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 14 2006

REMARKS

The preamble of the claim has been amended to call for making and using a stencil, as apparently suggested. Since this is simply correcting a matter of form, the amendment should be allowed.

With respect to the rejection under Section 112, first paragraph, suggesting that there is not sufficient enablement for depositing material under the central portion of the stencil plate, an enlarged version of Figure 2 is included which highlights the portion under the stencil plate. There, it can be seen that the present application does show the deposition under the stencil plate. It is further explained at the top of bottom of page 4 and the top of page 5 that conductive particles are forced through the stencil using a squeegee blade or the like to form the resinous member 22 in the form of an interrupted circular annulus.


One skilled in the art that this could be done by pressing down on the stencil 10, causing pre-deposited material to squeeze upwardly through or by simply squeezing the material in from the top while maintaining a gap.

Therefore, reconsideration of the enablement rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to the second paragraph rejection under Section 112, one way to squeeze the material under is to maintain a gap. The maintenance of a gap certainly would be within the skill of one skilled in the art. Such a gap is shown in Figure 2, between the stencil and the supporting surface thereunder. It is hard to believe one skilled in the art could not envision a way to get the material under the stencil, either by pre-depositing it and then pushing the stencil down or by simply squeezing the material through the openings.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 14, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057-2631  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]